REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 23-27 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 15-22 are cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 23 and 26 are amended. New claim 27 is added. The amendments to claims 1, 8 and 23 are supported by the specification at, for example, pages 20-23. New claim 27 is supported by the specification at, for example, pages 20-23. No new matter is introduced by the present Amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 4, 11 and 26 because "the formulae are not connected by a conjunction, such as 'and' between the last species." Applicants have added the word "and" between the last two species of claims 4, 11 and 26. Based on this correction, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claims 4, 11 and 26. Applicants thank the Examiner for a careful reading of the claims.

Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action, the Examiner imposed a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121, and indicated that restriction to one of the following invention is required: Group I (claims 1-14 and 23-26); or Group II (claims 15-22). Applicants confirm the provisional election made on April 15, 2005, to prosecute the invention of Group I (claims 1-14 and 23-26) without traverse. Claims 15-22 are canceled without prejudice.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12-14, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Application 2003/0198880 (the '880 application). The '880 application does not disclose a charge transport material where R_1 is a phenyl group and R_2 is an alkyl group or a phenyl group. In contrast, Applicants' invention, as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 23, relates to a charge transport material where R_1 is a phenyl group and R_2 is an

alkyl group or a phenyl group. Since this feature of Applicants' claimed invention is not disclosed by the '880 application, the '880 application does not prima facie anticipate Applicants' invention. Since the '880 application does not prima facie anticipate Applicants' invention, as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 23, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12-14, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the '880 application. Applicants note that the '880 application is not prior art to the present application for obviousness under section 103(a) since the subject matter of the two applications were under an obligation of common assignment when the present invention was obtained.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12-14, 23 and 25 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-5, 12 and 21 of co-pending Application No. 10/349,811. Applicants have included an appropriate Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the Examiner's double patenting rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12-14, 23 and 25 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian L. Jarrells
Registration No. 53,067

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuente, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 252-1535